DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 862 SP 029 295

AUTHOR Purcell, Larry O.
TITLE Factors Affecting the Quality of Staff Development.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Staff Development; Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

A review of the literature concerning the effectiveness and quality of staff development programs focuses on factors that affect the success of such programs. These factors include: individual concerns, training activities, applications, qualifications of consultants, scheduling, strategies, facilities, feedback, collaboration, and outcomes. It is concluded that most successful inservice education provides for active participation and exploration. The way that staff development programs are organized and delivered within an organization influences the effectiveness and accuracy of the content and methodology of what is taught and learned. A 10-page reference list is included. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285862

Larry O. Purcell
Consultant
Georgia Department of Education
Teacher Education and Staff Development

FACTORS AFFECTING THE QUALITY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

AUGUST 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 029 295

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L.O. Purcell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE QUALITY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development has been and will most likely continue to be a common element of attempts to produce quality education (Broudy, 1978). The taking of college courses has been a way of life for many classroom teachers since the nineteenth century (Broudy, 1978). Staff development programs have been a reliable source of income for colleges of education, and they have enabled school administrators to substitute "the counting of credits for the distasteful task of judging merit" (p. 58).

Staff development programs began in many school districts with the advent of special federally-funded programs because it was thought that "schools had few educators who could work successfully with the special needs of children and adolescents without additional training" (Buchanan & Bachelor, 1983, p. 4). Participants were exposed to new ideas or content on a level designed to expand their general understanding in their own or related fields (Dillon-Peterson, 1981).

Almost all of the staff development activities that school districts and independent schools provide for teachers and administrators occur during the school year

(Buchanan & Bachelor, 1983). Activities at the beginning of the year are usually limited to orientation sessions which last from a half-day to as long as three days (p. 5). These inservice activities "encourage . . . [teachers and administrators] . . . to continue to be active learners, maintaining lively, broad-based educational interests" (Dillon-Peterson, 1981, p. 128). In any given year the average teacher in the United States participates in about three days of inservice activities, rarely more than a day at a time and usually in brief workshops that "feature inspiring speeches and demonstrations of discrete skills" (Joyce & Showers, 1983, p. 1).

In-depth, long-term staff development programs are relatively few and involve participants in extended periods of training designed to focus on learning of specific materials or techniques which are expected to result in identifiable change in behavior on the part of the participant (Buchanan & Bachelor, 1983). A small number of staff development activities come from summer workshops sponsored by a school or school district where teacher participation is voluntary or from college and university course work that teachers initiate themselves (Buchanan & Bachelor, 1983).

In more recent years staff development has shifted away from college credits to programs designed for the specific purpose of addressing the needs of educators. Many educators are relying more heavily on staff development

programs they have designed than on those packaged into college courses and they are beginning to learn how best to design effective staff development programs (Conran & Chase, 1983).

Four major trends characterize current staff development programs (Cruickshank, Lorish, & Thompson, 1979). First, there is a movement towards developing a staff development program which includes inservice activities for the remediation and enrichment of educators--one which extends professional growth beyond initial certification. Second, there is a progression from a single to multiple inservice activities related to a common concern. Third, there is a shift from a staff development program designed for only certified personnel to a program which includes inservice activities for all employees of a school system. Finally, a movement is underway from a narrow control of staff development programs by school administrators and/or university professors to a collaborative governance that includes teachers (p. 27).

School districts concerned with educational quality schedule inservice programs to improve teacher effectiveness (Van Cleaf & Reinhartz, 1984). Conferences are held and workshops are presented as part of staff development programs. This is an attempt "to satisfy educators' appetite for viable solutions to existing classroom concerns and problems" (Van Cleaf & Reinhartz, 1984, p. 167). Nevertheless, innovative ideas and new approaches presented

during staff development activities are often not enough "to resolve many problems currently confronting educators because of the short-term limitations inherent in the organizational structure of staff development" (p. 167).

Teachers apparently want staff development activities (Allen, 1971; Bishop, 1976; Corrigan & Howey, 1980; Edelfelt, 1974; Rubin, 1978a; Schiffer, 1979; Wade, 1984; Wood & Thompson, 1980). A 1973-74 National Education Association assessment of teachers' needs in 20 widely distributed local associations revealed that staff development was believed to be a real need in every instance (Edelfelt, 1974). Although staff development is considered to be a widespread need, many factors affect the success of staff development programs.

Individual Concerns

An effective staff development program depends on the availability of activities that are congruent with the needs perceived by the participants (Bents & Howey, 1981; Marshall

& Caldwell, 1984; Verma, 1984). The inservice needs of teachers can be defined by a number of variables that include personal and professional interests, building and district concerns, and student characteristics (Griffin, 1982; Harris, 1980). According to Mckibbin and Joyce (1980), a staff development program should consider three concerns: (a) the societal need to create an educational system "which can regenerate itself continuously so that it can more effectively and humanely create environments within which all children can flourish" (p. 253); (b) the school level need to find ways to improve "their environments so as to nurture the personal, social, and academic potential of the young people in their neighborhood" (p. 253); and (c) the individual need to "live a satisfying and stimulating personal and professional life . . . which can help children to develop optimism, confidence, knowledge, and values" (p. 253).

Kilgore (1984) stated that staff development programs should consider both short- and long-range planning needs. There should be a close relationship between inservice activities and the development of curriculum, the improvement of instruction and the individual on-the-job needs of the teachers (Korinek et al., 1985). "The world of the classroom teacher demands problem specificity, solution relevancy, high success-probability, and a sense of personal reward" (Boutwell, 1979, p. 3). If any of these demands are

missing, teacher participation and interest in staff development activity are likely to be diminished.

According to Fuller (1969), if teachers are to be interested in efforts designed to assist their growth, a staff development program should reflect their concerns. Fuller described three stages which teachers pass through in their careers. In the "survival" stage, a teacher's main concern is with personal adequacy. In the "mastery" stage, a teacher concentrates upon content, methods of teaching, and developing teaching skills. The "impact" stage is the time when the teacher becomes concerned with his or her influence upon the student. It often requires careful planning to differentiate needs within these stages (Christensen, Burke, & Fessler, 1983).

Traditionally, needs assessment techniques have taken one of two forms: (a) the administrator, responsible for planning inservice education bases the needs assessment upon personal perceptions of staff deficiencies or a combination of his or her views and those of other administrators; and (b) an annual needs assessment attempts to assess the perceived professional needs of each district teacher (Banks, 1981; Mangieri & McWilliams, 1976). The results of these needs assessments purportedly are used to determine the design of the district's inservice education program (Clinton, 1985; King, 1980; Verma, 1984).

Teacher self-assessment is a seldom utilized but potentially effective technique for identifying staff

development needs (Iwanicki & McEachern, 1984). Self-assessment requires teachers to evaluate their performance, assess their strengths, and identify areas of needed improvement. Relevant staff development needs can be identified and appropriate inservice education can be planned by reviewing improvement areas expressed by teachers participating in self-assessment activities (Ward, 1985). According to Lawrence (1981), successful staff development programs treat participants as professionals and as conscientious people who want to continue to expand their skills. These programs "fit the design and methods to the people, to their programs, and to the context in which they work" (p. 6).

An advantage of a self-assessed, needs-based approach to staff development is that a program based on needs can be much more meaningful in that the result will generally focus on improved classroom instruction or administration (Roth, 1980, p. 48). If teachers believe that the inservice education program will be focused on their specific needs, then they likely will be much more motivated to participate in a meaningful way. Staff development programs that have differentiated learning experiences for different teachers are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for all participants (Chadwick, 1983).

Building a foundation for staff development programs is, therefore, the purpose of individual needs assessment.

"The strength of a program and its evaluation efforts depend upon planning, and planning depends upon valid needs assessments. Collecting reliable information is fundamental in meeting participants' needs and developing effective programs" (Lentz, 1983, p. 35). Like other aspects of staff development programs, needs assessments are

> dependent on the cooperation and support of those who will be involved. Therefore, it is important that staff development leaders explain why needs are being assessed and how the data will be used in making decisions. Different techniques, such as observations or interviews, furnish different perspectives which can be helpful. Similarly, different sources of information--students, teachers, administrators--offer a greater understanding of how needs can be met. (Lentz, 1983, p. 36)

According to Lentz (1983), analyzing the data will involve three steps for staff development coordinators. They must distinguish between perceived and actual needs, identify short- and long-term needs, and establish priorities (p. 39).

Training Activities

Determination of the needs of the teachers within a school system seems a prerequisite to the planning of meaningful inservice education programs (Brimm & Tollett, 1974; Brown, 1978; Clinton, 1985; Lawrence, 1974). Specific objectives should be developed and follow-up procedures

established to determine whether or not these objectives have been realized (Holly, 1983). A good workshop starts where the learner is and takes the learner "as far and as fast as the learner desires toward a mutually accepted goal of the learner and the workshop's resource personnel" while expressing "a concern for people as individuals and as members of the group who have personal needs that can be met" (Ernst, 1974, p. 496).

Harris provided a set of principles to guide staff development programs (1980, p. 157). He stated that all personnel within a school district should be provided opportunities for staff development activities, but no educator should be required to participate in a specific inservice activity just because it serves the convenience of scheduling, planning, or funding. Different client groups, or individuals designated on the basis of rational and explicit relationships between individual needs and program goals, should be recognized within any staff development program in order to facilitate optimum training and assure transfer of learning (Barrera, 1976; Burden & Wallace, 1983; Schroeder & Hainsworth, 1980).

Yarger and Mertens (1980, p. 139-164) described various career styles and indicated staff development activities which are appropriate to each. The beginning teacher moves from the supportive environment of colleagues into the complexity of school life where discipline, teaching skills, and content-knowledge are some of the main concerns. The

teacher with three-to-eight years experience is generally stable, tenured, and able to function in the classroom with a moderate degree of confidence. Mastering content and developing new professional roles (team leader, advisor) are frequent concerns at this stage. Highly experienced teachers do not have the same interests as less experienced teachers. For that reason, they should be involved in well-designed assessment activities, and staff development activities should draw upon their experiences.

When insight from adult development research is directly applied to staff development practices, teachers and principals begin "to look at themselves and their professions with the pride and enthusiasm necessary to make a difference in their work with students" (Levine, 1985, p. 15). Teachers and principals believe they have become "empowered after staff development activities which directly respond to their adult needs. They report that they have gained respect for their colleagues and renewed feelings of self-worth" (p. 15).

An individualized staff development activity is most appropriate because educators come to any inservice activity with a wide range of previous experiences, knowledge, skills, self-direction, interests, and competence (Brimm & Tollett, 1974; Cook, 1985; Ryor, Shanker, & Sanderfur, 1979; Zigarmi, Betz, & Jensen, 1977). McKibbin and Joyce (1980) indicated that staff development activity should be oriented just above the threshold at which an educator functions most

comfortably. If the optimal mismatch is achieved, the educator can function adequately but is pulled toward greater development. They also concluded that, in a self-actualizing climate, one is more likely to function at a higher level. A staff development program can best be facilitated for the individual educator by being a client-centered, diagnostic and prescriptive program (Hall & Loucks, 1979).

Van Cleaf and Reinhartz (1984) described different categories of participant types. Non-perceivers are those teachers who do not perceive a problem or the need to attend a staff development activity, and they generally will not react positively to a staff development program. Because they have an inability or reluctance to process the information, they do not see a need for it. They also will not benefit from typical staff development activities. An effective staff development program will require the development of a prerequisite knowledge base so that non-perceivers can recognize the need for the staff development activity (pp. 167-168).

Perceivers are individuals who recognize the need and the problem presented at the staff development activity (Van Cleaf & Reinhartz, 1984). There are two types of perceivers: (a) perceivers who have an adequate knowledge base which allows them to utilize readily the information presented, and (b) perceivers who can relate to the idea but do not have the knowledge base necessary to make effective

use of the inservice information presented during an inservice activity. This second type of perceivers will benefit little from a one-shot inservice activity format because they do not have adequate time to reorient their knowledge base relative to the new information. They will need additional staff development activities and building level support (pp. 168-169).

Arends et al., (1980) provided additional guidelines for a staff development program and the adult learner (pp. 22-31). At times there is no best technique of providing inservice education; even so, inservice training should be provided using the client's frame of reference. A staff development program should be approached as an extension of what teachers already know rather than from the point of view of assumed deficiency. Staff development program efforts start with an initial entry into a client group, move through phases of diagnosing needs, designing and delivering training, and are completed with follow-up and evaluation.

A study by Hunt and Sullivan (1974, p. 54) described a matching model of teacher training, one that optimizes instruction and needs. Their model seeks to match trainee "skill level" and "accessibility characteristics"--knowledge and ability--with specific training techniques. There are several benefits to this training model: training will be appropriate to the individual teacher's needs yet will not require total individualization of instruction; valuable

information about the teaching-learning process, as well as the training process will be gained along the way; a flexible, ongoing cycle of inservice training realizes the concept of continuing education of teachers.

Applications

Roth (1980) observed that teachers learn at different rates and have different learning styles. A staff development program is most effective if it is related to the needs of the teachers (p. 15). The needs of the teachers should be derived both from their perceptions of needs and the competencies they possess as compared to the competencies required for their jobs (Evans, 1981; Jones & Hayes, 1980; Lewis & Miel, 1972; Palmer, 1978).

Teachers will be more likely to commit to learning something when the goals and objectives of staff development activity are considered realistic, job-related, and immediately useful (Cook, 1985; Donlan, 1982; Haynes & Hill, 1985; Wood & Thompson, 1980). They will also attempt to learn, retain, and use what they perceive as relevant to their personal and professional needs (Jensen, Betz, & Zigarmi, 1978). The recognition and encouragement of teachers using learned skills and ideas in the pursuance of system goals encourage participation in a staff development program (Barrera, 1976; Mazzarella, 1980). Teachers will resist learning situations which they believe are an attack on their competence, and they often reject prescriptions by others for their learning (Jensen et al., 1978).

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) surveyed federal projects and discovered that several aspects of teacher staff development activities had major positive effects on project outcomes and continuation. The best training addressed the specific needs of each individual teacher. Teachers participated in staff development programs because they believed inservice training would help them to become better teachers, not because of extrinsic rewards (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, Mazzarella, 1980; Rappa, 1983). Staff development activities were judged productive where they were consistent with the plans and intentions recipients have for their own work, responsibilities, and long-term professional development (Bosco, Crowell, & Harring, 1975; Fenstermacher & Berliner, 1983; Rappa, 1983).

In summary, staff development programs should be systematic, relevant, individualized, and related to the goals of education for the district (Pelton, 1983; Roth, 1980). A staff development program should be dynamic and should change as the personal and professional needs of the staff change. To be meaningful, staff development programs should be systematically organized around the common purpose of meeting the needs of individuals participating in the program (Addleton, 1982; Arends et al., 1980; Olivero, 1976; Roth, 1980).

Qualifications of Consultants

Characteristics of the consultant have a significant impact on what participants acquire and use (Jones &

Steinbrink, 1986; Rappa, 1983). The basic criteria for selecting workshop consultants are that they be knowledgeable in the subject area, able to relate knowledge on a practical level, and capable of attracting the attention of teachers (Addleton, 1982; Anderson, 1984; Edwards & Barnes, 1985; Hutson, 1979; Talbert & Smoyer, 1984). Presenters should possess an awareness that the teaching-learning process is a human transaction requiring skill in human relations (Fisher, 1976). The consultant also should be aware of the teachers' needs and motivations and have the ability to accept the learner as a person (Fisher, 1976). Consultants may be university personnel, teachers, administrators, or curriculum supervisors (Joyce, McNair, et al., 1976).

The consultants chosen "should be qualified beyond question for the role asked of them . . . should be the best qualified persons to be obtained . . . [and] should be oriented well in advance to the task expected of them" (Oliva, 1984, p. 371). Career stages and the expertise of teachers need to be considered. The more information consultants have about the participants, "the better they can appeal to the participants' diverse learning needs" (Vacca, 1983, p. 52). Faculty input should be sought concerning the selection of consultants. This careful screening should "make the faculty more receptive to the message the consultant may bring to them" (Oliva, p. 371). A consultant must be "good teacher with good interpersonal

skills, recognized expertise, and the ability to build on the participants' knowledge and experience" (Dillon, 1978, p. 11).

Selecting a consultant is probably the most difficult part of designing effective inservice activity (Barrera, 1976; Behm, 1985; Brown & Scribner, 1982; Evans, Byrd, & Coleman, 1978). Because teachers often like to watch other teachers demonstrate various techniques, outstanding classroom teachers should conduct inservice education programs for other teachers (National Inservice Network, 1980; Welch, 1985). They should act as facilitators and undergo specific training to prepare them for this role (Buskin, 1970; Griffin, 1982; Kilgore, 1984; Rappa, Genova, & Walberg, 1983).

Teachers and school-related personnel are seen as more appropriate consultants for on-the-job objectives, but professors are preferred "for objectives concerned with obtaining a new credential, preparing for a career change within education, and acquisition of new knowledge about teaching in general and personnel development" (Arends et al., 1980, p. 27). The most effective inservice consultants are professional colleagues or university personnel whose positions have been embedded in the school (p. 27). Local people, especially teachers, may be used as a primary resource in facilitating inservice activities (Mertens, 1982b; Pelton, 1983). Because of the need for ongoing assistance, "local resource personnel who could provide

'on-call' advice . . . [are] . . . more effective than outside consultants whose advice . . . [is] . . . seen as too general, untimely, and irrelevant" (Mazzarella, 1980, p. 182).

The use of local resource personnel has several advantages (Pelton, 1983). The local consultant essentially knows the school system and community, is probably less expensive than the "expert", may have more credibility among staff, and will likely be available for important follow-up activities. Also, the administration may have a chance to give recognition to a staff member (p. 13). However, if an outside consultant is used, one should

> (a) work with the staff members to define the problem carefully and then outline precisely how the consultant is expected to help with the issues defined, (b) clearly articulate this expectation to the entire staff and to the consultants, and (c) make sure that follow-up activities are planned and executed. (Pelton, 1983, p. 13)

Outside consultants may be helpful in supportive roles. However, a consultant "should offer neither too much nor too little help" (Hutson, 1979, p. 7). The purpose of consultant work is to help teachers adapt, not adopt innovations, and to help them learn how to solve problems rather than solve their problems for them (Hutson, 1979, p. 7). The role the consultant is to fill, as well as the content to be conveyed, should be clearly defined in order

to match the training needs of teachers with the abilities of the consultants.

Effective program delivery, therefore, involves careful selection of resource persons who are adept at reaching varying levels of experience within a group and helping learners at all levels apply new knowledge to their experience (Koll & Hetland, 1984). Effective consultants "see themselves as members of a group engaging in mutual inquiry and problem-solving (Koll & Hetland, 1984, p. 87). Consultants "transfer their expertise to specific people and audiences through training" (Miller & Verduin, 1979, p. 129). When planning for the use of outside consultants, "the more effort in planning how, when, where, and for what purpose consultants will be used" the more likely desired services and benefits will be accrued (Miller & Verduin, 1979, p. 137).

Scheduling

Scheduling usually turns out to be an important factor in the success of a staff development program (Condra, 1986; Korinek et al., 1985). Inservice activities should be in sequence so that teachers can progress through training activities that gradually increase in complexity (Rubin, 1978b). Because staff development activities should take place during the teacher's work day, unencumbered time for teacher inservice activity can be gained through team teaching, flexible scheduling, or the use of

paraprofessionals and teacher aides (Griffin, 1982; Long, 1977; Pelton, 1983; Rubin, 1978b).

Different inservice education objectives require different amounts of activity time (Howey & Joyce, 1978; Kilgore, 1984; Rubin, 1978b). The time devoted to a training unit should be commensurate with its complexity and the strengths of the individual teacher. Little professional growth will occur without adequate time. Teachers' work schedules should be reorganized so that there is opportunity for improvement (Rubin, 1978b; Schlechty, 1983). Inservice education programs should be scheduled at times that do not compete with, but complement, other professional obligations (Gold, 1987; Lawrence, 1974; Talbert & Smoyer, 1984).

> Staff development programs carefully planned are . . . worth the time required for implementation. After school sessions of an hour or less never have and never will amount to an adequate vehicle for inservice education. Staff members must be freed for a few hours, a day, a week, a month, or a year to engage in worthwhile tasks once they have been identified. (Otto & Erickson, 1973, p. 8)

The specifics of scheduling logically depend on variables such as the availability of local budgetary support, the availability of relevant resources, and the flexibility of the local organization (Otto & Erickson, 1973; Zigarmi et al., 1977). A realistic schedule of inservice activities

"should be well-spaced and integrated into the school calendar, avoiding last minute conflicts and surprises" (Barrera, 1976, p. 2).

The most effective inservice education programs appear "to be ongoing--stretching throughout the school year--rather than a short workshop or course that is soon forgotten" (Mazzarella, 1980, p. 184). Professional days are overwhelmingly preferred to other inservice time-related options (Berman & Friederwitzer, 1981; Brown & Scribner, 1982).

To facilitate participation in the inservice education program, the program should be as accessible as possible. If the program can be designed to individualize time commitments, program accessibility is enhanced (Roth, 1980). "Teachers learn at different rates, so an inservice education program should provide for each individual to complete inservice education objectives at his or her own rate" (Roth, p. 16). Inservice education should be "flexible to fit any schedule, and ease of entering and exiting" should be characteristic of the inservice education program (p. 62).

In addition to accessibility, an effective program must be "deliberately structured to be as efficient as possible and time commitments will depend upon the amount of inservice work in which the individual is engaged" (Roth, 1980, p. 62). Time normally allocated for inservice education programs should be "part of the normal work load

and assignment schedule of personnel" (Harris, 1980, p. 157). Special events, requiring substantial variations in the normal work load and assignment of personnel, "should be utilized sparingly and planned as to provide reimbursement for overtime. Time allocations allow for continuity of training experience. Schedules need to accommodate long-range to short-range plans, and should provide for flexibility to accommodate inservice education program variations" (Harris, 1980, p. 166). Finally, schedules should respond to needs and differences within individual participants with due consideration to the many demands of staff time. (Joyce, Howey, et al., 1976; Joyce, McNair, et al., 1976; National Inservice Network, 1980).

Strategies

Staff development activity should provide options for reaching learning objectives, and a good learning activity includes "recognition of the vast reservoir of concepts, attitudes, experiences, and knowledge that teachers possess" (Dillon-Peterson, 1981, p. 140). Four areas which should be considered when selecting appropriate teaching methods for staff development activities are (a) awareness--realizing the importance of a topic and beginning to focus on it, (b) concepts and organized knowledge--understanding the concepts inherent in the topic and their relationship to the teaching/learning process, (c) principles and skills--acquiring the skills necessary to implement the new concepts in the classroom, and (d) application and problem solving--

using the acquired skills to teach the concepts and including those skills into one's own teaching repertoire (Joyce & Showers, 1980, p. 380). Specific instructional techniques include using small group discussion, observing other participants or consultants in practice, and practicing new techniques in the work setting while training is still going on (Lawrence, 1981; Mazzarella, 1980; Onore & Lester, 1985; Rappa, 1983; Talbert & Smoyer, 1984; Walberg & Genova, 1983; Ward, 1985). Teachers prefer formats which include field-based experiences, demonstrations, and group work (Mertens, 1982b; Pelton, 1983; Walberg & Genova, 1983).

Bosco et al., (1975) concluded that a single school workshop with 10 to 20 participants has a more positive impact than multi-school workshops. Successful workshops may require teachers to try out and report on their success with new skills or information while providing teachers with in-class technical assistance and resources (Bosco et al., 1975; Lawrence, 1981). Effective workshops embrace "accepted goals that are feasible and explicit, provide a match of resources with learner needs and personality, and offer the learners an opportunity to gain strength and objective evaluation from one's colleagues" (Ernst, 1974, p. 496). While they do not separate content from interpersonal relationships, they do assure learners the ability to "communicate honestly and effectively with themselves and with each other," and permit the learners to "function within their own limits" (Ernst, 1974, p. 496).

Inservice education programs should include anticipating the problem of learning transfer throughout the inservice activity, developing a high degree of skill prior to classroom practice, and providing explicitly for executive control. Also, they should provide for practice in the workplace immediately following skill development, provide for coaching by peers, and generate a learning-how-to-learn effect (Griffin, 1982; Joyce & Showers, 1983).

Based on the anticipated expertise the participant gains from inservice, the design of the inservice activity should provide sequence and materials for differentiated experiences even when common goals, objectives, and needs are being served (Harris, 1980; Wade, 1984). The activities and materials should be designed to assure active, meaningful, and purposeful experiences as much as possible. A great variety of activities should be planned "that are task-oriented and reality-based" (Harris, 1980, p. 159). The strategy of implementation of the activity should consider the setting and the teachers (Vacca, 1983). Teachers must themselves gain knowledge from the innovation before they can be expected to "begin to use the innovation in their classroom and devise ways to improve its effect on their students" (Vacca 1983, p. 52).

An effective staff development program provides a variety of options. It has "a flexible program format, stresses individual and small-group learning, is concrete,

and is directly tied to ongoing activities" (Mertens, 1982a, p. 12). Staff development activities should "not steer away from complex tasks because the more difficult the task, the higher the level of staff commitment" (Pelton, 1983, p. 10).

An inservice education program should "match the staff development content and delivery modes to the teachers' stage of development" (Burden & Wallace, 1983, p. 7). In general, teachers in the early stages "need much assistance with the technical skills of teaching and . . . benefit most from a highly structured, directive staff development program" (p. 7). Practical information and application are most useful. Teachers who are "advanced developmentally . . . seek information to add variety in their teaching and . . . prefer a collaborative approach to staff development" (p. 8). By contrast, teachers at the highest developmental level favor more complex and cross-curricular activities. They prefer small group arrangements and non-directive staff development programs (Burden & Wallace, 1983).

Miller and Verduin (1979) described three possible types of staff development programs: formal, non-formal, and informal (p. 72). They also indicated that staff development programs may "range from large group presentations to individualized programs, from structured to unstructured learning experiences, and from predetermined content to self-directed learning" (p. 72). An informal learning program for staff development is characterized by self-directed, problem-oriented, open entry and open exit

activities (p. 73). Non-formal learning is extremely flexible and unstructured, and employs group activities in which participants share responsibility for the control and direction of the group (p. 78). Formal learning is "a structured, systematic sequence of programs, courses, and lessons, which are usually arranged according to specific time offerings. Content is somewhat standardized and is organized and prepared for transmission prior to instruction" (p. 83).

Inservice education programs, therefore, that have different training experiences for different teachers are more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs that have course activities for all participants (Lawrence, 1974). Rubin (1978b) indicated that teacher retraining should be dealt with in several discrete units. Each unit should be based on an analysis of a teaching task and should prepare the teacher to perform the task and provide criteria for determining the teacher's degree of success.

Facilities

The success of an inservice education program often depends on the facility chosen for the inservice activity (Gold, 1987; Lawrence, 1981; Speiker, 1978), and on the availability of necessary special equipment (Harris, 1980). Arrangements such as "securing a room large enough to accommodate all participants seated at tables when writing or manipulative activities are planned assures comfort for

participants and makes certain activities feasible" (Harris, 1980, p. 87).

Different inservice education programs "for different locations based upon the local need and staff planning should be encouraged" (Schroeder & Hainsworth, 1980, p. 16). The location for the inservice activity should be determined "by training requirements rather than by arbitrary preferences of either . . . [consultants] . . . or administrators" (Harris, 1980, p. 158). The use of remote locations

> should be an open option for any inservice activity or program to be determined by cost/benefit analysis in comparison with local alternatives. When resources needed for training are not available locally or can be more economically utilized at a remote location, . . . [the facility] . . . should be similar to the one in which the participants usually work. (Vacca, 1983, p. 53)

There are two primary locations for inservice activity: the school itself, which seems to be the better place for inservice education, and higher education institutions (Nicholson, Joyce, Parker, & Waterman, 1976, p. 21). Teachers seem to prefer inservice experiences that occur in the local school setting (Hutson, 1979; Talbert & Smoyer, 1984; Zigarmi et al., 1977). Inservice education programs in schools and on college campuses are equally capable of affecting teacher behavior, but the school settings tend to

be capable of influencing more complex behavior changes in teachers (Lawrence, 1974).

Feedback

Evaluation is as crucial as any other component to the design and implementation of any staff development program (Barrera, 1976; Orrange & Van Ryn, 1975; Rowan, Capehart, & Sharper, 1977; Titsworth & Bonner, 1983), because effective staff development program planning requires "knowing where a program has been and what is happening in the process" (Orrange & Van Ryn, p. 55). An evaluation should include the teachers' impressions of the "presenter's knowledge of the topic, the appropriateness of the method of presentation, the usefulness of the information for the classroom and recommendations for future inservice in the topic" (Behm, 1985, p. 42). Effective inservice education planning groups should review all information gathered during the inservice education program and make recommendations for ongoing staff development program planning (Baden, 1982; Behm, 1985; Goddu, Crosby, & Massey, 1977; Ward, 1985). Evaluation data can be gathered by using opinionnaires, interviews, observer(s) reports, student tests, case studies, activity logs, and recorded lessons (Verma, 1984).

The logical time to begin evaluation planning is the point "when the original objectives are considered" (King, Haynes, & Newman, 1977, p. 687). At this time a decision should be made concerning the uses of evaluation, the

selection of the evaluation instruments, the identification of the evaluator(s), and the processes to be used in evaluation (Mertz, 1983). Appropriate evaluation

> not only reveals the extent to which participants have benefitted from the program but suggests further inservice needs. Thus the cycle is complete, back to where local wants, needs, and problems are once more suggested for treatment through subsequent inservice efforts. (King et al., 1977, p. 687)

A systematic evaluation effort, therefore, should focus primarily upon identifying strengths, weaknesses, and possible improvements in staff development programs (Harris, 1980; Neil, 1985; Verma, 1984; Wilson, 1978).

> Objective data, free of bias and sampling error, should be utilized for evaluation purposes . . . and . . . both short-term and long-range evaluation efforts should be planned whenever possible. The scope and complexity of the evaluation design should be dictated by the extensiveness of the . . . [staff development] . . . program, the importance of goals, and the technical capabilities of the staff. (Verma, 1984, p. 160)

Other authorities indicate that evaluation has distinct benefits for those who evaluate. Harris (1980) and Mertz (1983) concluded that the people directly involved in any aspect of staff development program need and can profit from

the reinforcement that evaluation can offer. Data-based decision making involves

> identifying information needs, collecting the appropriate information, arranging the information in a form that is usable for the [planning] committee, getting the information to . . . relevant staff members in a timely fashion, and having the information used by the decision makers. (Greenfield, 1983, p. 29)

Bishop (1977) stated that evaluation should also measure the leadership-management functions of inservice education implementation. In addition, it should assess the appropriateness of program goals, objectives, activities, and resources in relation to learner needs (Miller & Verduin, 1979). Baden (1982) and Bishop (1977) contended that inservice education program evaluation should be both formative and summative. Formative evaluation focuses on what happens during inservice education program implementation and helps review the effectiveness of ongoing activities (Mertz, 1983). Teachers should be provided feedback on their cumulative growth during the inservice education program (Rubin, 1978b). Summative evaluation, which occurs at the end of an inservice activity, measures the overall effectiveness of the staff development program (Rubin, 1978b; Verma, 1984). Evaluation of staff development programs begins with a measurement of "all effects of a program with no formal commitment to their relative values" (McDonald, 1982, p. 4). Ideally, the

results of the evaluation serve as input for the next needs assessment.

Various authorities differ, however, in their views of evaluation. According to King (1980), staff development program evaluation consists of two types. Questionnaire-based evaluation is frequently conducted at the final session of the inservice education program and provides a useful critique of the structure and logistics of the program. This type of evaluation is not very useful, however, for determining whether or not the programs have met their objectives (Boschee & Hein, 1980). The other type of evaluation is performance based, which may occur long after the conclusion of the inservice activity (King, 1980). This evaluation may be based on "observation of staff behavior, follow-up interviews, or measurement of program toward the achievement of some previously identified objective" (p. 4). This type of evaluation is not very useful for providing feedback on the logistics or structure of the inservice activity, because the evaluation's "impressions tend to fade over time" (p. 4).

Other authorities indicate that staff development program evaluations need to provide information about the overall condition of the staff development program and the environment created to facilitate professional growth; the adequacy of the processes being used to initiate, manage, and maintain the staff development program; and the effects of specific inservice activities on participants, the

school, and students (Broyles & Tillman, 1985; Duke & Corno, 1981; Virginia State Department of Education, 1980). Hite and Howey (1977) concluded that evaluation should include "measures of both teacher growth and effects upon pupils" (p. 14). McDonald (1982) stated that "the number and kind of opportunities an individual takes to discuss a staff development program or to comment on it . . . indicates . . . the kind of impact which the program has had on that person" (p. 9).

Unlike the other researchers, Fenstermacher and Berliner (1983, 1985) viewed evaluation of a staff development program as a much broader process. For them, evaluation consists of three dimensions: worth, merit, and success. Worth relates to the sound educational principles on which the inservice activity is based. To have worth, the activity must be "fair and without harm to participants" (p. 20), the activity must be founded on research evidence and experience, and the activity must be provided a method for evaluating its success and merit. Merit pertains to the sensibility and variability of the activity to participants' needs, the positive incentives encouraging participants, and the maintenance of the positive outcomes of the staff development activity. Success concerns whether or not the activity has clear objectives, competent instruction, correct diagnosis, applicability, and sufficient duration.

Evaluation, "though critical to the continued refinement of local inservice education programs, is often

denied the attention it deserves" (King et al., 1977, p. 687). Evaluation is

> the most important yet most neglected aspect of staff development. It is important because evaluation tells whether the goals and objectives have been met. It is neglected because by the time a program should be evaluated it is too late to do anything meaningful. (Mertz, 1983 , p. 59)

Evaluation enhances the likelihood of participant involvement in and benefit from a staff development activity. Without evaluation there can be no assurance that inservice efforts are effective (Hawthorne, 1983), and "in this age of accountability, without evaluation there can be no accounting for the expenditure of time and money required for worthwhile inservice education programs" (Otto & Erickson, 1973, p. 158). Reviewing and discussing progress toward group goals provide interactive feedback--an evaluation that permits those responsible for staff development program implementation to adjust expectations and plans (Arends et al., 1980; Goldsberry & Harvey, 1985; Pelton, 1983). Furthermore, such attention to ongoing evaluation "typically contributes to participants' sense of ownership, sense of accomplishment, and task persistence" (Goldsberry & Harvey, 1985, p. 39). When teachers participate in the "determination, initiation, and organization" of their own professional development, the incentive to improve is greatly strengthened (Rubin, 1978b,

p. 300). Quality practices in inservice education are designed to result in staff development programs which are collaborative (Harris, 1980; Hite & Howey, 1977; Lawrence, 1974; National Inservice Network, 1980; Roth, 1980).

Collaboration

Teachers in inservice activities should have opportunities to express opinions and exercise choices (Conran & Chase, 1983; Dillon, 1974; Mazzarella, 1980). They should

> feel the need for whatever program is developed and must be in control of their fate from start to end of the program. Ideally, participants would move gradually from dependence on consultants to independent control of program. Sustained productive involvement is a critical attribute to successfully continuous inservice. Specifically, participants need to be involved in the selection of program content and structuring the design of the training. (Conran & Chase, 1983, p. 26)

Teachers may be more likely to accept new inservice education if they are involved in a collaborative process of implementing and managing inservice activities (Chadwick, 1983; Korinek et al., 1985; Lawrence, 1981; Lehr, 1984; Westby-Gibson, 1967).

Greenfield (1983) reported that planning committees work best when membership is voluntary and when members have an interest in the professional growth of teachers and

administrators (Greenfield, 1983). Teacher participation in these planning committees is believed to be an antidote for low morale and job-related stress (Devore, 1971; Liebes, 1983).

> Teachers feel satisfied, supported, and increasingly motivated when they are asked to articulate their training needs and concerns. Involving educators in planning their professional growth activities operates as a type of group therapy that increases in the teacher the desire to achieve on the job. (Liebes, 1983, p. 6)

Collaborative planning involves two or more people working together for mutual benefits (Greenfield, 1983; Hutson, 1979). Planning of staff development programs should include administrators who suggest areas where growth is desirable and teachers who suggest to administrators ways that administrators might develop plans for their own professional improvement (Furey, 1978; Joyce, McNair, et al., 1976; Moore & Hyde, 1981). This collaboration would likely enhance the quality of instruction and administration and also provide decentralization of the governance of an inservice education program (Nicholson et al., 1976). Inservice education programs should be designed so that

> needs are mutually defined by teachers and . . . [administrators] . . . and a variety of staffing options are developed which identify some staff who are better at presenting content and others who are better

> at, and better placed, creating follow-through with the school district situation. (Joyce, Howey, et al., 1976, p. 22)

Burden and Wallace (1983) viewed collaborative organizing and planning of staff development program as promoting "greater mutual contribution to the aims, perspectives, and methods" of inservice activities (p. 2).

Effective collaborative planning also involves sharing ideas and information (Greenfield, 1983). It also includes "deciding the 'rules of the game,' trusting and respecting one another, making compromises, and having all parties benefit as a result of their involvement" (p. 27). For collaborative work efforts to be successful, interpersonal relationships must be developed among the planners within a non-threatening climate (Goldsberry & Harvey, 1985). School-based programs, in which teachers participate "as helpers to each other and planners of inservice activities, tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than do programs that are conducted by colleagues or other personnel without the assistance of teachers" (Lawrence, 1974, p. 254).

Other reasons given for collaborative planning are to improve the quality of inservice

> by gaining multiple perspectives, to increase participants' sense of ownership, to create a climate in which joint planning and operating are encouraged, to enlarge the circle of participants, and to reinforce

> the notion that decisions ought to be made on the basis of competence rather than position. (Hutson, 1979, p. 6)

The greater the number of participants engaged in collaborative practices, the higher the value placed on interdependence with others and the greater the prospects for a staff development program to exert an influence on educational improvement (Little, 1981).

Effective implementation of a staff development program requires "personal contact and interaction among clients, planners, providers, and consultants, and the growth of a professional supportive culture" (Hutson, 1979, p. 7). The greater the ability of a staff development program to "secure agreements for . . . [collaborative] . . . participation in implementation, the greater its prospects for influence over teachers practices" (Little, 1981, p. 34). A staff development program implementation strategy should include continual professional growth activities within a framework of collaborative planning by participants.

Outcomes

Several authorities have concluded that a staff development program is more effective when it is school based with long range goals for instructional improvement and is incorporated into the teachers' classrooms (Behm, 1985; Burden & Wallace, 1983; Chadwick, 1983; Evans et al., 1978; Korinek et al., 1985; Lawrence, 1974; Talbert &

Smoyer, 1984). Narrowly focused programs are believed to be less beneficial to teachers and administrators than are staff development activities which involve a general effort on the part of the entire school faculty (Arends et al., 1980; Lawrence, 1974; Ward, 1985).

Providing the opportunity to learn information or techniques that have the potential to improve job performance is a powerful staff motivator (Dillon, 1978). When individuals pursue goals which they perceive as being "relevant to and important for their work, both their willingness to devote their energies and the likelihood of goal attainment are achieved" (Goldsberry & Harvey, 1985, p. 38). The more relevant the staff development activity is to the work setting, the more likely the program is to be effective (Kilgore, 1984; Pelton, 1983; Schlechty, 1983; Verma, 1984).

A staff development program should be aimed at changing teacher and student behavior (Arends et al., 1980; Buskin, 1970; Hutson, 1979; Rubin, 1978b; Talbert & Smoyer, 1984; Templeman, Fredericks, Bunse, & Moses, 1983). Staff development programs in school settings tend "to be capable of influencing more complex behavior changes in teachers" (Chadwick, 1983, p. 12) and should be designed for the improvement of specific skills and the transference of these skills to classroom instruction (Kilgore, 1984; Rappa, 1983; Rubin, 1978b).

Because change and improvement are outgrowths of inservice training, staff development is a process involving the inclusion of new knowledge, aptitude, and attitudes within the classroom setting (Verma, 1984). A staff development program that helps teachers grow in self-confidence and competence, while encouraging new, improved practices within the classroom is likely to be successful and to reinforce future inservice efforts (Talbert and Smoyer, 1984). Teachers want realistic training that will "pay off in the classroom today. Teachers are looking for workable, concrete ideas that have immediate application" (Pelton, 1983, p. 13). Focusing on direct, concrete experiences where the teacher applies what is learned is important because "many learners operate on a concrete operational stage of intellectual development; abstract, word-oriented presentations are not enough to change behavior" (p. 9). Thus, theoretical presentations are acceptable only if practical inservice activities are included (Pelton, 1983).

Most inservice activities should present concepts and develop skills transferable to the problems of the daily classroom and school operations (Brimm & Tollett, 1974; Rubin, 1978b). One way of accomplishing a transfer of skills is to operate inservice education programs within the schools; in this way participants are able "to focus upon problems which have personal meaning to them" (Brimm & Tollett, 1974, p. 525).

Specific school objectives may be successfully achieved by allowing inservice participants to "try out new things in the classroom . . . and then receive appropriate feedback" (Lawrence, 1981, p. 5). Through feedback participants have the opportunity to experience success or failure (Lehr, 1984).

Teachers who view a staff development program as an integral part of the activities of the school and view improvements in knowledge and practice as never ending may place increasing demands on the quality of inservice activities (Little, 1981).

> Where analysis, evaluation, and experimentation are treated as tools of the profession, designed to make work better (and easier), and where such work is properly the work of the teacher, teachers can be expected to look to staff development to help provoke questions, organize analysis, generate evidence of progress, and design differences in approach. (p. 11)

Inservice efforts should attempt to combine theory and practice, to focus the teacher back into the classroom, and to assist the teacher to develop, integrate, or alter the concepts and techniques learned through classroom implementation (Banks, 1981; Brown, 1978).

The ability to function effectively and to accomplish a specified objective is a powerful source of motivation and satisfaction in professional growth (Rubin, 1978b). Professional growth opportunities that relate to life in the

classroom affect motivation and according to Berman and Friederwitzer (1981), should have a direct influence on the problems teachers encounter in their work. Staff development programs should provide teachers with the time and tools necessary to conceptualize their experiences and to reach insights that alter and improve their perceptions of their role (Rubin, 1978b).

Inservice activity participants are often optimistic that they will continue to use the knowledge, materials, attitudes, and skills gained through inservice workshops in the future (Jones & Steinbrink, 1986; Rappa, 1983). Therefore, staff development programs should allow teachers to take from the inservice activities teacher-made or commercial instructional products that they can use in classrooms (Banks, 1981; Rowan et al., 1977). In addition, staff development programs need to provide long-time support of teachers seeking to implement the ideas or materials developed during the inservice activity (Bosco et al., 1975). Also, the teacher should be provided "a variety of experiences as a producer of knowledge rather than simply absorbing knowledge or techniques" (Bosco et al., 1975, p. 7). According to Goddu et al. (1977), these tangible outcomes or products desired from the inservice education program should be identified before the actual training program is designed and may take many forms such as written reports, slide/tapes, video-tapes, oral presentations on tape, material packages, and so forth (p. 27).

Other Considerations

The task of relating inservice activities to objectives involves a consideration of personnel, time, facilities, equipment, materials, and cost (King, 1980; Otto, 1973). Staff development programs "should have three major components: attitudes, pedagogical skills, substantive knowledge" (Wood et al., 1981, p. 89). Successful workshops "supply teachers with resources--information and activities that are easily adaptable to the classroom setting" (Rappa, 1983, p. 6). Teachers indicate "a greater concern for quality inservice presentations which include support and encouragement, variety, and teacher sharing. Teachers also want inservice education programs where teachers present new and different ideas" (Ainsworth, 1976, p. 107).

Most effective inservice education programs "involve methods of observation of actual classroom practices, microteaching, video/audio, feedback, and practice" (Wade, 1984, p. 52). Moderately effective are coaching, modeling, mutual assistance, printed material, production of instructional materials, programmed study, and films (Davison, 1985; Wade, 1984; Ward, 1985). Less effective are discussion, lecture, games/simulation and field trips (Lawrence, 1981, p. 5). Successful inservice education provides for active participation and for exploration. Teachers view the inservice education aspects of their professional organizations, conventions, conferences,

workshops, journals, and newsletters as moderately useful (Zigarmi et al., 1977, p. 548).

Inservice methods and modes of delivering staff development activities include presentation of theory or description of skills or models of teaching and modeling or demonstration of skills or models of teaching (Burden & Wallace, 1983, p. 3). Group instruction format models include role-playing, demonstration, group experiences, discussion, brainstorming, group projects, work stations, independent activities, material production, media, and lectures (Evans, 1981, p. 71). According to Miller and Verduin (1979), teachers learn best in an interesting environment where the pace changes from time to time, where a variety of materials are used, and where they are respected as worthwhile individuals. The way staff development programs are organized and delivered within an organization influences the effectiveness and accuracy of the content and methodology of what is taught and learned (p. 72).

REFERENCES

Addleton, B. (1982, November). Development/operation of a multisystem staff development consortium in rural Alabama. Paper presented to the National Council of States on In-service Education, Atlanta, GA. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 225 699).

Ainsworth, B.A. (1976). Teachers talk about in-service education. Journal of Teacher Education, 27(2), 107-109.

Allen, D.W. (1971). In-service teacher training: A modest proposal. In L. J. Rubin (Ed.), Improving in-service education (pp. 109-131). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Anderson, S. L. (1984). Teacher training techniques from four observational perspectives. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 20(1), 16-28.

Arends, R., Hersh, R., & Turner, J. (1980). Conditions for promoting effective staff development. Washington, DC: Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 183 506).

Baden, D. J. (1982). A user's guide to the evaluation of staff development. In F. McDonald, J. Popham & D. J. Baden, Assessing the impact of staff development in special education (pp. 37-58). Seattle, WA: Washington University Program Development Assistance System.

Barrera, R. M. (1976). Catching the kinks in staff development. San Antonio: Intercultural Development Research Association. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 125 150).

Behm, R. (1985). You want a workshop or a revival meetin'? English Education, 17(1), 39-43.

Bents, R. H. & Howey, K.E. (1981). Staff development--change in the individual. In E. Dillon-Peterson (Ed.), Staff development/organization development (pp. 11-36). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berman, B. & Friederwitzer, F. (1981). A pragmatic approach to in-service education. Action in Teacher Education, 3(1), 51-58.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change: Vol. 8. Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 159 289).

Bishop, L.J. (1976). Staff development and instructional improvement: Plans and procedures. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bishop, L.J. (1977). Visualizing a staff development plan. In C.W. Beegle & R.A. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development/staff liberation (pp. 52-59). Washington, DC: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Boschee, F. & Hein, D.D. (1980). How effective is in-service education? Phi Delta Kappan, 61(6), p. 427.

Bosco, J.J., Crowell, R., & Harring, R. (1975). The development and evaluation of an in-service education model to develop informal individual learning and teaching practices. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University Center for Educational Research. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 110 411).

Boutwell, R.C. (1979, April). Florida linkage system. In-service process workshop: Building a bridge. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 175 116).

Brimm, J.L. & Tollett, D.J. (1974). How do teachers feel about in-service education? Educational Administration, 31(6), 521 525).

Broyles, I. & Tillman, M. (1985). Relationships of in-service training components and changes in teacher concerns regarding innovations. Journal of Educational Research, 78(6), 364 371).

Broudy, H.S. (1978). In-service teacher education--paradoxes and potentials. In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teacher: Trends, processes and prescriptions (pp. 58-67). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, C.E. (1978). Systematic ad-hocism: An approach to responsive in-service and school change. Durham, NH: New Hampshire University. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 180 945).

Brown, J.M. & Scribner, R. (1982). Special needs in-service training for vocational educators: How, when and by whom? Journal of Vocational Education Research, 7(4), 15-28.

Buchanan, A. & Bachelor, P. (1983). Staff development, better teaching and school improvement. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory For Educational Research and Development. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 250 788).

Burden, P.R. & Wallace, D. (1983, October). Tailoring staff development to meet teacher needs. Paper presented at the mid-America mini-clinic of the Association of Teacher Education, Wichita, KS. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 237 506).

Buskin, M. (1970). Putting the screws to in-service training. School Management, 14(9), 23-24.

Chadwick, G. (1983). The effectiveness of in-service programs: What do we know? what is needed? Vocational Aspect of Education, 35(90), 11-16.

Christensen, J., Burke, P. & Fessler, R. (1983, April). Teacher life-span development: A summary and synthesis of the literature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Clinton, H.R. (1985). Inservice: Teacher education of the people, by the people, and for the people. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(19), 47-49.

Condra, J.B. (1986). This regional in-service training program is voluntary and teachers flock to it. American School Board Journal, 173(2),40.

Conran, R.C. & Chase, A. (1983). Staff development for success. Illinois School Research and Development, 19(3), 24-29.

Cook G.E. (1985). Six honest serving-men: Using the message of research to design effective staff development programs. English Education, 17(1), 18-25.

Corrigan, D.C. & Howey, K.R. (1980). Special education in transition: Concepts to guide the education of experienced teachers. Reston, VA: Eric Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 195 076).

Cruickshank, D.R., Lorish, C., & Thompson, L. (1979). What we think we know about in-service education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(1), 27-32

Davison, D.M. (1985). Using new technology to provide inservice education for rural teachers. Small School Forum, 6(3), 21-22.

Devore, P.W. (1971). Variables affecting change in inservice teacher education. Final report to the U.S. Office of Education. Chicago: Designs for change.

Dillon, E.A. (1978). A school board member's guide to staff development. Washington, DC: National School Boards Association. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 153 324).

Dillon-Peterson, E.A. (1981). Perspective 1981. In E. Dillon-Peterson (Ed.), Staff development/organization development (pp. 1-10). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Donlan, D. (1982, November). Research on staff development: The inland area writing project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Reading Association, San Diego, CA. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 224 021).

Duke, D.L. & Corno, L. (1981). Evaluating staff development. In E. Dillon-Peterson (Ed.), Staff development/organization development (pp. 93-111). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum.

Edelfelt, R.A. (1974). In-service education of teachers: Priority for the next decade. Journal of Teachers Education, 25(3), 250-252.

Edwards, S.A. & Barnes, S. (1985). A research-based staff development model that works. Educational Leadership, 42(7), 54-56.

Ernest, W. (1974). What makes a workshop jell? Educational Leadership,31(6), 496-498.

Evans, J. (1981). In-service training for the 1980's. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 2, 67-73.

Evans, R.L., Byrd, D.M. & Coleman, T.M. (1978, March). Responsive teacher in-service needs assessment in an urban setting. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 152 731).

Fenstermacher, G.D. & Berliner, D.C. (1983). A conceptual framework for the analysis of staff development. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Fenstermacher, G.D. & Berliner, D.C. (1985). Determining the value of staff development. Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 281-314.

Fisher, D.W. (1976). A teaching-learning theory for results in in-service education. In R. Eiben & A. Milliren (Eds.), Educational change: A humanistic approach (pp. 270-279). LaJoua, CA: University Association.

Fuller, F.F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental characterization. American Educational Research Journal,6(2), 207-226.

Furey, A.J., Jr. (1978). Participation and personal growth: Keys to staff development. In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teachers: Trends, processes and prescriptions (pp. 195-198). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goddu, R., Crosby, J. & Massey, S. (1977). In-service: The professional development of educators. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(2), 24-30.

Gold, G.G. (1987). A reform strategy for education: Employer-sponsored teacher internships. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(5), 384-387.

Goldsberry, L., & Harvey, P.L. (1985). Collaborative staff development in an elementary school. Journal of Staff Development, 6(1), 37-45.

Greenfield, W.D. (1983). Collaborative planning and data-based decision making. In Staff development leadership: A resource book (pp. 27-34). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Griffin, G.A. (1982). Staff development. Washington DC: National Institute of Education.

Hall, G.E. & Loucks, S. (1979). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perceptions (pp. 36-68). NY: Teachers College Press.

Harris, B.M. (1980). Improving staff performance through in-service education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hawthorne, R.D. (1983). The personal and professional dimensions of staff development. In Staff development leadership: A resource book (pp. 11-18). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Haynes, N.M. & Hill, J. (1985). Teachers' perception of the availability and usefulness of selected continuing education activities. Negro Educational Review, 36(2), 62-65.

Hite, H. & Howey, K.R. (1977). Planning in-service teacher education: Promising alternatives. Washington, DC: Eric Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 183 560).

Holly, M.L. (1983). Staff development and adult learners. In Staff development: A resource book (pp. 19-26). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Howey, K.R. & Joyce, B.R. (1978). A data base for future directions in in-service education. Theory Into Practice, 17(3), 206-211.

Hunt, D.E. & Sullivan, E.V. (1974). Between psychology and education. Hillsdale, IL: Dryden Press.

Hutson, H. (1979). In-service best practices. Bloomington, IN: National In-Service Network.

Iwanicki, E.F. & McEachern, L. (1984). Using teacher self-assessment to identify staff development needs. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2), 38-41.

Jensen, D., Betz, L., & Zigarmi, P. (1978). If you are listening to teachers, here is how you will organize in-service. NASSP Bulletin, 62(417), 9-14.

Jones, L.L. & Hayes, A.E. (1980). How valid are surveys of teacher needs? Educational Leadership, 37(5), 390-382.

Jones, R.M. & Steinbrink, J.E. (1986). Curriculum institutes for teachers: Utilizing local resources. Science Education, 70(2), 105-109.

Joyce, B.R., Howey, K.R., Yarger, S.J., Hill, W.C., Waterman, F.T., Vance, B.A., Parker, D.W. & Baker, M.G. (1976). Issues to face (ISTE Report No. 1). Palo Alton, CA: Teacher Education Concepts Project.

Joyce, B.R., McNair, K.M., Diaz, R., McKibbin, M.D., Waterman, F.T. & Baker, M.G. (1976). Interviews--Perceptions of professional and policy makers (ISTE Report No. 2). Palo Alton, CA: Teacher Education Concepts Project.

Joyce, B.R. & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 379-385.

Joyce, B.R. & Showers, B. (1983). Power in staff development through research in training. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kilgore, A.M. (1984, January-February). The application of research generalizations from staff development to a rural school district: A case study-research report. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators.

King, J.C., Hayes, P.C. & Newman, I. (1977). Some requirements for successful in-service education. Phi Delta Kappan, 58(9), 686 687.

King, N.J. (1980). The role of school administration in staff development. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp.

Koll, P.J. & Hetland, R.R. (1984). What staff development can learn from the private sector: An andrological approach. Journal of Staff Development, 5(1), 81-89.

Korinek, L., Schmid, R. & McAdams, M. (1985). Inservice types and best practices. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18(2), 33-38.

Lawrence, G. (1974). Patterns of effective in-service education: A state of the art summary of research for changing teacher behaviors in in-service education. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 176-424)

Lawrence, G. (1981, May). A synthesis of research on the effectiveness of staff development programs. Paper presented at the Ohio Department of Education annual conference on in-service education, Columbus, OH. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 211 499).

Lehr, C. (1984). Meeting staff development needs of teachers. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 55(6), 73-75.

Lentz, M.T. (1983). Needs assessment and data collection. In Staff development leadership: A resource book (pp. 35-42). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Levine, S.L. (1985). Translating adult development research into staff development practices. Journal of Staff Development, 6(1), 6-17.

Lewis, A.J. & Miel, A. (1972). Supervision for improved instruction: New challenges, new responses. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Liebes, S. (1983, April). An aging teacher corps: How should school systems respond? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council of Exceptional Children, Detroit, MI. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 235 553).

Little, J.W. (1981, April). School success and staff development in urban desegregated schools: A summary of recently completed research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Long, D.H. (1977). Competency-based staff development. In C.W. Beelge & R.A. Edelfelt (Eds.), Staff development/staff liberation (pp. 78-90). Washington, DC: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mangieri, J.N. & McWilliams, D.R. (1976). Designing an effective inservice program. Journal of Teacher Education, 27(2), 110-112.

Marshall, J.C. & Caldwell, S.D. (1984). How valid are formal, informal needs assessment methods for planning staff development programs. NASSP Bulletin, 68(475), 24-30.

Mazzarella, J.A. (1980). Synthesis of research on staff development. Educational leadership, 38(2), 182-185.

McDonald, F.J. (1982). Criteria strategies for assessing the impact of staff development programs. In F. McDonald, J. Popham & D. Baden (Eds.), Assessing the impact of staff development program (pp. 1-29). Syracus, NY: National Dissemination Center.

McKibbin, M. & Joyce, B. (1980). Psychological states and staff development. Theory into Practice, 19(4), 248-255.

Mertens, S. (1982a). Teacher centers: Support for professional practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2), 10-12.

Mertens, S. (1982b). The basics in in-service education: Findings from the Rand and teacher center studies. Action in Teacher Education, 4(1), 61-66.

Mertz, R.J. (1983). Evaluation and reassessment. In Staff development leadership: A resource book (pp. 59-70). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Miller, H.G. & Verduin, J.R., Jr. (1979). The adult educator--a handbook for staff development. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Moore, D.R. & Hyde, A.A. (1981). Making sense of staff development programs and their costs in three urban school districts. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Chicago: Designs for Change.

National Inservice Network. (1980). Quality practices task force. Final report. Bloomington, IN: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation.

Neil, R. (1985). Inservice teacher education: Five common causes of failure. Action in Teacher Education, 7(3), 49-55.

Nicholson, R.M., Joyce, B.R., Parker, D.W. & Waterman, F.T. (1976). The literature on in-service teacher education (ISTE Report No. 3). Palo Alto, CA: Teacher Education Concepts Project.

Oliva, P.F. (1984). Supervision for today's schools (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Olivero, J.L. (1976). Helping teachers grow professionally. Educational Leadership, 34(3), 194-200.

Onore, C. & Lester, N.B. (1985). Immersion and distancing: The ins and outs of inservice education. English Education, 17(1), 7-13.

Orrange, P.A. & Van Ryn, M. (1975). Agency roles and responsibilities in in-service education. In R.A. Edelfelt & M. Johnson (Eds.), Rethinking in-service education (pp. 47-55). Washington, DC: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Otto, W. & Erickson, L. (1973). In-service education to improve reading instruction. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Palmer, T.M. (1978). In-service education: Intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation. In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teachers: Trends, processes, and prescriptions (pp. 215-225). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pelton, M.H. (1983). Staff development in small and rural school districts. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Rappa, J.B. (1983). Characteristics of successful staff in-service training. Boston, M.A: State Department of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 243 867).

Rappa, J.B., Genova, W.J. & Walberg, H.J. (1983). Staff, school and workshop characteristics affecting continued use and adaptation of knowledge: A follow-up study. Boston: Massachusetts State Department of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 243 872).

Roth, R.A. (1980). Individualized staff development programs for competency development: A systematic approach. Lahham, MD: University Press of America.

Rowan, R.E., Capehart, E. & Sharper, G.H. (1977). Characteristics of successful in-service programs. In A. Osborne (Ed.), An inservice handbook for mathematics education (pp. 93-105). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Rubin, .L.J. (1978a). Contining professional education in perspective. In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teachers: Trends, processes, and prescriptions (pp. 3-42). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rubin, L.J. (1978b). Some postulations and principals on the continuing professional education of teachers. In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teacher: Trends, processes and prescriptions)pp. 293-306). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ryor, J., Shanker, A. & Sanderfur, J.T. (1979). Three perspectives on in-service education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(1), 13-19.

Schiffer, J. (1979). A framework for staff development. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives (pp. 4-22). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schlechty, P. (1983). Understanding and managing staff development in an urban school system (Final report). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 519).

Schroeder, G.G. & Hainsworth, J.C. (1980, March). Meeting the needs of the public education in W. Kentucky. Establishing collaborative multi-dimensional programs for in-service education. Paper presented to the American Society for Curriculum Development, Atlanta, GA. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 186 406).

Speiker, C.A. (1978). Do staff development practices make a difference? In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teachers: Trends, processes and prescriptions (pp. 254-261). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Talbert, R. & Smoyer, S. (1984, April). Perspectives on staff development implications for Oregon's collaborative approach to school improvement. Proceedings of the Oregon Council for Continued Professional Development Seminar. Salem, OR: Oregon State Board of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 250 824).

Templeman, T.P., Fredericks, H.D., Bunse, C. & Moses, C. (1983). Teaching research in-service training model. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded,18(4), 245-52.

Titsworth, G. & Bonner, C. (1983). School improvement in a local Michigan school district. Journal of Staff Development, 4(1), 120-128.

Vacca, J.L. (1983). Program implementation. In Staff development leadership: A resource book (pp. 51-58). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Van Cleaf, D.W. & Reinhartz, J. (1984). Perceivers and non-perceivers: Adaptation through in-service. Clearinghouse, 58(4), 167-170.

Verma, S. (1984). Staff development--A systematic approach. Education Canada, 24(3), 9-13.

Virginia State Department of Education. (1980). In-service education for school personnel in Virginia. Guiding principles. A priority in pursuit of quality education. Richmond, VA: author.

Wade, R.K. (1984). What makes a difference in in-service teacher education? A meta-analysis of research. Educational Leadership, 42(4), 48-54.

Walberg, H.J. & Genova, W.J. (1983). Staff, school and workshop influences on knowledge use in educational improvement efforts. Boston, MA. Massachusetts Department of Education.

Ward, B.A. (1985). Teacher Development: The challenge of the future. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 52-57.

Welch, R.J. (1985). A district-wide approach to individualized staff development. NASSP Bulletin, 69(483), 119-122.

Westby-Gibson, D. (1967). Inservice education--perspectives for educators. Berkeley, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 015 161).

Wilson, S. (1978). Career long staff development--an educational necessity. In L. Rubin (Ed.), The in-service education of teachers: Trends, processes and prescriptions (pp. 275-289). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wood, F.H. & Thompson, S.R. (1980). Guidelines for better staff development. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 374-378.

Wood, F.H., Thompson, S.R. & Russell, F. (1981). Designing effective staff development programs. In E. Dillon-Peterson (Ed.)., Staff development/ organizational development (pp. 59-91). Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Yarger, S.J. & Mertens, S.K. (1980). Testing the waters of school-based teacher education. In D. Corrigan & K. Howey (Eds.), Concepts to guide the education of experienced teachers (pp. 139-164). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Zigarmi, P., Betz,L. & Jensen, D. (1977). Teachers' preferences in and perceptions of in-service education. Education Leadership, 34(7), 545-551.